The University of Chicago

THE MOTIVATION OF CHANGES MADE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT BY JUSTIN MARTYR AND CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

A STUDY IN THE ORIGIN OF NEW TESTAMENT VARIATION

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

JUNE, 1942

By
ERIC LANE TITUS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1945

Introduction

The study proposed in this thesis has to do with the motivation of non-accidental variation as this phenomenon is related to the text of the New Testament. New Testament variation is usually considered under two heads, namely, accidental and intentional. Accidental variations are those resulting from the scribe's ignorance, carelessness, fatigue, lack of concentration, and similar factors. Accidental variation is usually given the place of first importance in studies on textual variation. But certain critics have seen that a consideration of non-accidental variation may make a contribution to our knowledge of the primitive text.[1] It is hoped that the present study will indicate that change of the non-accidental variety must be taken seriously into account.

As over against accidental change in the text, that of the non-accidental variety must be attributed to certain motives. Sometimes these motives were clearly defined as was the case with Origen when he took liberties with the text for historical reasons. In his discussion of Matthew 27: 45, for example, he argues that history records no such phenomenon as is there set forth. The argument of an eclipse of the sun, moreover, is invalid since the Passover took place at the full-moon. Origen holds, therefore, that the phrase, "the sun being eclipsed," was introduced by "the secret enemies of the church of Christ" so that "the Gospels might be attacked with some show of reason." Moreover, the "darkness" of the Gospels was the result of dense clouds collecting above the land of Judaea and Jerusalem so as to obscure the sun's rays. History knows nothing about it because it was merely local in scope. His logical conclusion is that the reading, "the sun being eclipsed," should be omitted from the true text.[2]

---

[1]French writers on textual theory like Jacquier, Lagrange, and Goguel have made particularly valuable suggestions in this connection.

[2]R. B. Tollinton, Selections from the Commentaries and

This type of variation is clearly evidenced in manuscripts of the Fourth Gospel. In some manuscripts, "the sixth hour" is changed to "the third" in John 19: 14 in order to bring it into accord with Mark 15: 25 as to the hour of crucifixion. And in the same Gospel we have the reading, "Do you go up to the feast: I go not up unto this feast."[1] This reading with the negative οὐκ is supported by Codex Sinaiticus and some others. But in Codex Vaticanus and most of the other uncials we read "I go not yet [οὔπω] up to this feast." This change is probably explained as the attempt of copyists to reconcile the words of the Gospel with the fact that Jesus did go up to Jerusalem.

The problem of New Testament non-accidental variation is not a new one as any modern textual critic will attest. Indeed, it was well known to the ancients themselves. Instances may be cited. Gaius, writing at the beginning of the third century, was prompted to write thus:

> These heretics have audaciously corrupted the divine Scriptures under the pretext of correcting them. In order to convince oneself that this is not a false accusation he has only to glance at their exemplars. Those of Asclepiades are entirely different from those of Theodotus. Their disciples have mutilated these corrected copies which in reality are corrupted copies.[2]

Tertullian gives some classic examples. He said of Marcion: "Let the sponge of Marcion blush with shame."[3] Also, "I do not marvel that he took away syllables since he commonly withdrew whole pages. What Pontic mouse was ever such an eater as he who gnaws at the Gospels."[4]

Sozomen tells the story of a bishop who used the elegant word σκίμπους for κράββατος in John 5: 8 and was rebuked by another with the words, "Are you better than he who spoke the word κράββατος, that you are ashamed to use his words?"[5]

Clement of Alexandria accuses "certain people" of changing

Homilies of Origen (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929), pp. 114-19.

[1]John 7: 8.

[2]Taken from E. Jacquier, Le Nouveau Testament dans l'Eglise Chrétienne (Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1913), II, 340, 341.

[3]Tertullian Adversus Marcion v. 4. [4]Ibid. i. 1.

[5]Sozomen Ecclesiastical History 11.

the text (μετατιθέντων τὰ εὐαγγέλια).[1]

But while the problem is not a new one, modern scholarship has seen in non-accidental variation a fresh significance for New Testament research. The following statement is an illustration of one aspect of this perception:

> The legitimate task of textual criticism is not limited to the recovery of approximately the original form of the documents, to the establishment of the "best" text, nor to the elimination of "spurious readings": It must be recognized that every significant variant records a religious experience that brought it into being. This means that there are no "spurious readings": the various forms of the text are sources for the study of Christianity.[2]

And it may be added that non-accidental variation is important, not only for the study of Christian history, but also for the study of the primitive text as the goal of that study has been traditionally conceived, namely, the recovery of the original autographs. If the forces back of non-accidental change can be identified and classified it is clear that the accomplishment of this task will be facilitated.

It was conceived that the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers might provide a laboratory where these forces could be observed in actual operation. Extensive New Testament quotations and allusions set in an argumentative context, nearness to the time when the text was in its most fluid state were factors which made the idea seem worthy of consideration. If it is possible to discover the motives which prompted these writers to choose one variant as over against another or to produce a new reading it is legitimate to assume that these forces were not confined to them alone, but were in general operation.

Immediately, however, a difficulty presented itself. The Ante-Nicene literature is so extensive that canvassing of the whole was not conceivable. Some justifiable limitation was therefore necessary. Nevertheless, the selection of material had to be representative and comprehensive enough to warrant its use.

Consideration of the Apostolic Fathers seemed of doubtful value for the purposes of this inquiry. In this connection, the

---

[1]Clement _Stromata_ iv. 6.

[2]Donald W. Riddle, "Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline," _Anglican Theological Review_, XVIII, No. 4 (October, 1936), 221.

results of a study by a committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology is most instructive. This committee set out "to prepare a volume exhibiting those passages of early Christian writers which indicate, or have been thought to indicate acquaintance with any of the books of the New Testament." The writings examined were the following: Barnabas, the Didache, I Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Hermas, II Clement. The books of the New Testament were arranged in four classes "according to the degree of probability of their use by the several authors." The first class includes those about which there was no reasonable doubt, either because they are mentioned or because of other indications of their use. The second class includes those books the use of which, in the editors' estimation, is highly probable. Class three represents a lower degree of probability. The fourth and final class includes books the use of which is too uncertain to permit any reliance to be placed upon them. The results are very interesting. The only New Testament books included in the first class are Romans, Hebrews, and I Peter. The second class shows up somewhat better but is not convincing. The overwhelming number of quotations falls into classes three and four. The conclusion seems to be that in these writers, quotations from the New Testament are too loose and uncertain for the purposes of this study.

Omitting reference, for the moment, to the writers of the second century who are not classed with the Apostolic Fathers, we come to a consideration of Origen's writings. Here, the problem is not one of a scarcity of quotation. Quite to the contrary, his use of Scripture is extensive and, while he does not always quote with exact liberalness, a comparison of his text with that of Westcott and Hort shows a large degree of correspondence. With Origen one moves into a different atmosphere from that of his predecessors. The former spontaneity is gone. There is about his writings a formality far removed from anything offered by the earlier writers. Here, the careful critic is at work. Origen is text-conscious. The period of spontaneous creativity has passed. His writings, for this reason, fall outside the scope of our investigation.

But lying within this period (which follows that of the Apostolic Fathers, but is pre-Origen), are several important Christian leaders and thinkers. This investigation will confine itself to the writings of two of these, namely, Justin Martyr and

Clement of Alexandria. They represent the transition period between the Apostolic Fathers, on the one hand, and the great scholar Origen on the other.

Of the quotations of Justin it must be acknowledged that they display few indications of literalness. It may even be advanced that he usually or always quoted from memory. But this very condition may provide some very useful information as to the employment of Scripture in this period. Exactness of quotation or not, citation from memory or otherwise, the fact remains that this is the way the New Testament was used in this period: the New Testament was made to support the argument, or to put it more correctly, a writer was by his departure reproducing the true text, the original reading of the New Testament.

The only question is as to whether Justin's New Testament quotations are identifiable. A cursory study of Professor Goodspeed's Die Ältesten Apologeten convinces one that this is very frequently the case. He there provides a critical text of three of Justin's works. It is true that in many instances he can only recommend a comparison with New Testament passages, but these are offset by numerous others where identification is accomplished.[1]

Passing to Clement of Alexandria, we note that his writings are very extensive and that he quotes freely from the New Testament. The extensiveness of his writings provides opportunity to check Clement against himself in many instances. As for his New Testament quotations, it is true that he does not always quote "accurately." But here we must be reminded that accuracy is a very relative and tenuous matter. His method of dealing with Scripture throws light upon what Goguel calls the "latent forces" which were at work to modify it. The Alexandrian Father is still in the creative period and is the product of it. And, it may be added that he is contributing to it. In view of these facts his writings deserve careful consideration.

To the men who dealt with it in this early period, the text was more than a succession of words and letters. Their interest was not that of modern textual criticism on its more mech-

---

[1]Professor Goodspeed may have been generous in his identification of New Testament passages, but sufficient allowance has been made for this possibility in the above statement.

anical side. For them, the text was a thing of meaning and that meaning met their own experience at certain points. The text expressed itself on themes running all the way from the doctrine of the divine Logos to injunctions on how to act in the Christian assembly. Between these extremes of sublime and prosaic utterance the text gave expression to a wealth of thought and experience touching life at almost every point. On the other side of the picture, the people of the second century enjoyed an experience as broad as the cosmopolitan character of their environment would signify. It was almost inevitable, therefore, that their experience should not always coincide with that expressed in the New Testament books. These points of difference, the result of cultural influences, the necessity of coming to terms with the world about them, and the development of dogma within the group, represent the points of conflict with the sacred writings.

These early Fathers probably illustrate in their writings the way in which these difficulties were overcome, for they recognized no discrepancy within Scripture itself or between Scripture and the essential facts of their own experience. To appreciate how this gap was bridged it must be borne in mind that this was a period of spontaneity, an era in the history of the text before it had achieved a high degree of fixity, before scholarship had begun its work of introducing some semblance of order. This is why, according to Scrivener, "the worst corruptions to which the New Testament text has ever been subjected originated within a hundred years after it was composed."

The method of quotation employed by our writers is, therefore, important. It is often contended that one method was to resort to memory, with no manuscript check. The result was that faulty memory gave rise to numerous variations from the text of Scripture. That this was so may scarcely be denied. But it is suggested here that in numerous instances where memory was resorted to, the resulting variant was not due to faulty memory alone. Another factor entered in. The context of a given passage may show that the argument advanced by the writer needs the support of the peculiar wording given the New Testament quotation. Whether or not the reading was true to the actual words of the New Testament passage seems to have been a secondary consideration. The spirit, not the words, was the important thing.

Actually, from our point of view, this underlying philoso-

phy led to new and curious divergences from the original. And while the ancients themselves did not consider that they were falsifying the sacred text, nevertheless we can see how this freedom was a most effective condition for successful Christian apologetic, and for the establishing of accepted dogmas.

The matter of canonicity is closely related to this early Christian use of Scripture. Generally speaking, it is assumed by scholars that canonicity tended toward exactness of quotation. The church served as a protection against the inroads of change, conserving the original purity of the sacred text. But it is doubtful if this claim can be supported. Using an example from modern times the acute French scholar Lagrange takes the opposite position. He points out that the traditional view just mentioned has been too readily assumed, that the traditional theologians are not greatly concerned with exactness in their use of Scripture. The critics are the ones who consider this to be important. The ecclesiastics place their emphasis on the spirit as over against the literal word.[1] Once this position of Lagrange is accepted, the degree of canonicity attributed to the New Testament books by our authors becomes, for our purpose, relatively unimportant. For variation will take place in any case.

If motivation played so important a part in this early period in the writings of the Fathers, we cannot assume that they were unique in this regard. May not this judgment be extended so as to include the scribes who transcribed the manuscripts? Every critic of the text agrees that scribes did make such changes in the text. Who, then, can define the limits of this procedure? This question is especially pertinent as applied to this transition period when these "latent forces" were so definitely in operation.

This contention is fortified by the witness of men like Irenaeus and Origen who speak of the diversity of manuscripts existing in their day. Origen is able to write thus:

> But now great in truth has become the diversity of copies, be it from the negligence of certain scribes, or from the evil daring of some who correct what is written, or from them who in correcting add or take away what they think fit.[2]

---

[1] Critique Textuelle (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1935), II, 23.

[2] Ibid., p. 13.

And it shall be pointed out later at some length that a copyist considered it his sacred duty to make "corrections" in the text.

If what we have said regarding the early Fathers is true, the implications are important for textual criticism. It calls into question one aspect of the use made of the Fathers in the search for the true text, namely, the patristic evidence for readings earlier than themselves. It may be that the emphasis should fall elsewhere. Perhaps these early writers were themselves so completely a part of the process of change that more attention should be paid to the text after them than prior to them. Scrivener poses the question: "Do not the earliest ecclesiastical writers describe readings as existing and current in their own copies, of which few traces can be met with at present?"[1] This is probably true and we may also say that the cumulative effect of a writer's quotations is to give some indication of the nature of the text actually used by him. But it is important to remember that a given variant may or may not imply a lost reading. This conclusion grows out of the early method of using Scripture. It is therefore a fallacy to look merely for an earlier text embodying the variant. It is equally important to look at the existing texts which came into being after the writer had used the variant. It may even be advanced that the coincidence of reading between the writer and certain manuscripts as over against still other authorities may be due to the fact that by using the variant he succeeded in giving it prominence and popularity or introduced it himself.

But perhaps the safer and more important base is the total situation in which these motivating forces were active. It may be impossible to establish the relation between a variant reading that is found earliest in a work of a given Father and its inclusion in later manuscripts. But it is safe to say that the total situation of which he was a part succeeded in giving it importance enough to warrant its inclusion in the manuscripts. When variation occurs, therefore, it is necessary not only to consult the preponderance of manuscripts and the "best" manuscripts, but also to take into account as tools the motivating forces which were present in this early, fluid, transitional period. This method

---

[1] F. H. A. Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, ed. Edward Miller (4th ed.; London: George Bell and Sons, 1894), II, 277.

should be an integral part of any attempt to determine the original autographs of the New Testament books.

Judged on the basis of dominant motivation the New Testament variants in the writings of Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria fall into distinct categories. Proceeding through these writings, book by book, we have discovered that these categories may be designated as historical, harmonistic, ethical and practical, stylistic, explanatory, and dogmatic. This list might be extended by a broader sampling of early Christian literature than has been undertaken here, but it probably includes the more important motivations for variation.

It will be observed that these categories, for the most part, are not new. Textual critics have been aware of them in the history of manuscript transmission, and have given them some consideration. But this attention has not been considerable, and it is this lack of emphasis that gives the present listing importance. What has largely been taken to be the more or less sporadic and arbitrary work of scribes in consciously changing the text assumes a broader base in the "Sitz im Leben." The process of change may have been more intimately related to the experience of people than is usually assumed.

From this point of view, it will be recognized that "important" variants are not our concern any more than are those recorded in the books on textual criticism as slight. Our concern is to illustrate a principle, to bear witness to actual forces operating in the life of the people to modify the New Testament text. In this process, the so-called unimportant variation may provide real evidence. Indeed, we may go further and say that the "unimportant" variant may demonstrate that the process of motivation was as broad as the experience of the people who handled the text. Not only were the great themes and dogmas of religion involved, but also the matters of everyday experience. Clement, in his antagonism to ornamentation, illustrates this very clearly.

The Greek texts used are the following: Goodspeed's <u>Die Ältesten Apologeten</u>, 1914, for the quotations of Justin Martyr, and Stählin's <u>Clemens Alexandrinus</u> in "Die griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller" series, for Clement of Alexandria. The excellence of both of these needs no elaboration. We are not unaware of the possibility of error even here. Nevertheless, having

these critical texts at our disposal made it possible to approach our task with a high degree of confidence.

We come now to a consideration of the various categories. Each of these will be prefaced by a brief discussion of the type of motivation to be followed by a few examples from our two writers.

Historical Variation

So far as the writings of Justin and Clement are concerned, this classification does not stand well represented. Only one instance is noted here, and it may have other than historical significance. Chronological schemes, as set forth in these early Fathers, usually appear to have motivations other than those of historical accuracy and interest. Undoubtedly, however, the historical interest was to some degree present in those early years and exerted a degree of influence upon the text. Perhaps the change from οὐ to οὔπω in John 7: 8 had historical as well as harmonistic motivation. The variants Γεργεσηνῶν and Γαδαρηνῶν of Matthew 8: 28 and Βηθαβαρᾶ and Βηθανία, John 1: 28 may have a connection with this type of motivation.[1] And a statement like the following which relates the variant reading of John 19: 14: "Now it was the Preparation of the Passover: it was about the sixth hour," lends support to this category:

> And it was the preparation about the third hour, as the accurate books have it, and the autograph copy itself by the Evangelist John, which up to this day by divine grace has been preserved in the most holy church of Ephesus, and is there adored by the faithful.[2]

Peter, however, comes from a period somewhat later than our transition age and may not fairly represent our writers. It is probable that the historical interest developed more strongly with the work of men like Origen who used what more nearly approaches the techniques of modern textual criticism.

Goguel calls attention to what he calls corrections of physical errors or contradictions of fact which we might consider

---

[1]Scrivener, op. cit., p. 12, says: "The variations between Γεργεσηνῶν and Γαδαρηνῶν Matt. 8: 28, and between Βηθαβαρᾶ and Βηθανία John 1: 28 have been attributed, we should hope unjustly, to the misplaced conjectures of Origen."

[2]Fragments from the writings of Peter of Alexandria, The Ante-Nicene Fathers (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1886), VI, 283.

in this present relation: In Matt. 5: 39 ("Whosoever smites you on your right cheek, turn to him the other also"), δεξιάν is omitted by D, k, Syr[s] because one would most naturally hit the left cheek. But it may be noted that the Talmud says that the back-handed blow is the most insulting. In Luke 6: 1, which the Authorized Version translates as follows, "And it came to pass on the second Sabbath after the first, that he went through the corn fields," δευτεροπρώτῳ is omitted by Aleph, B, C, L as unintelligible. In Luke 23: 32 c, e, Syr[s] omit ἕτεροι before δύο κακοῦργοι. The passage runs: "And there were also two other malefactors, led with him to be put to death."

The instance to be noted from the Patristic writings comes from Clement of Alexandria, The Stromata 1. 21. Clement there quotes Luke 3: 23. This verse of Luke has always been a difficult one for translators. The Authorized Version reads, "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age," which scarcely makes sense. The American Revised has, "And Jesus, himself, when he began to teach was about thirty years of age. . . ." Moffatt gives, "At the outset Jesus was about thirty years of age." The Twentieth Century New Testament translates, "When beginning his work Jesus was about thirty years old." Goodspeed renders it, "Jesus himself was about thirty years old when he began his work."

Clement disposes of any difficulty by a direct statement to the effect that "Jesus was coming to his baptism, being about thirty years old" (Ἦν δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐρχόμενος ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὡς ἐτῶν λ'). In doing so he has ἐρχόμενος for ἀρχόμενος and adds ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα. He thus makes it clear that Luke had in mind the time of Jesus' baptism. Furthermore he is able to show that Jesus' ministry lasted only one year by quoting Isaiah 51: 1, 2: "He hath sent me to proclaim the acceptable year [ἐνιαυτὸν] of the Lord." He is aware of Luke's rendering of the passage and takes ἐνιαυτὸν to refer to a definite period of one year in length. At the end of that time Jesus was put to death, that is, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius. Counting back thirty years brings him to the birth date of Jesus in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of Augustus. That is what he is endeavoring to prove. The argument runs:

> And our Lord was born in the twenty-eighth year, when first the census was ordered to be taken in the reign of Augustus. And to prove that this is true, it is written in the Gospel by Luke as follows: "And in the fifteenth year,

> in the reign of Tiberius Caesar, the word of the Lord came to John, the son of Zacharias." And again in the same book: "And Jesus was coming to his baptism, being about thirty years old," and so on. And that it was necessary for him to preach only a year, this also is written: "He hath sent me to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." This both the prophet spake and the Gospel. Accordingly, in fifteen years of Tiberius and fifteen years of Augustus; so were completed the thirty years till the time He suffered.

It may be noted that Ephraem's commentary on the _Diatessaron_ has: "And Jesus himself was about thirty years of age when he came to be baptized of John."

Irenaeus (_Against Heresies_ ii. 22. 5) has an apparently conflate reading:

> How could He have taught unless He had reached the age of a Master? For when He came to be baptized, He had not yet completed His thirtieth year, but was beginning to be about thirty years of age (for thus Luke who has mentioned His years, has expressed it: "Now Jesus was, as it were, beginning to be thirty years old when He came to receive baptism"); and He preached only one year reckoning from His baptism.

This variant may have grown out of the desire in the early church to determine a satisfactory chronology. The length of Clement's discussion bearing on this matter in the _Stromata_ shows how elaborately chronological schemes were formulated.

Harmonistic Variation

The tendency to harmonize the various accounts of Scripture was inevitable. There is, for one thing, the bent of the human mind for unity. This, we may be sure, was present in the ancient world as well as in the modern. And working with it was the theory that Scripture cannot contradict itself. That which seemed to do so was apparent, not real. Also, as far as the New Testament was concerned, the Gospel was not several but one. The four or more accounts are but aspects of the one Gospel. There could, from the very nature of the case, be no fundamental contradiction. When apparent contradictions came to mind they could be reconciled by allegorizing and spiritualizing or by changes in the literal words of the text. For the real truth of Scripture was not to be found in the outward and material letter.

The attempts of the copyists to bring Scriptural accounts into harmony with one another often resulted in textual variation. We find evidences of this in the manuscripts themselves. We have

seen how some change "the sixth hour" of John 19: 14 to "the third hour" in order to bring the statement of the writer more into accord with Mark 15: 25 as to the hour of the crucifixion. Another change of this sort is the substitution in John 7: 8 of οὔπω for οὐ where the reading "I go not [οὐ] up to the feast" is changed to "I go not yet [οὔπω] up to the feast." This change makes it agree with the fact stated just two verses later that Jesus did go up to the feast mentioned.

Goguel gives an instance of omission in the interest of harmonization. It is Luke 23: 34: "And Jesus said Father forgive them; for they know not what they do." Some manuscripts omit it altogether and so bring the account more into conformity with the Synoptic tradition as represented in Matthew and Mark.

There is another phenomenon to be noted in this connection, namely, that the New Testament must agree with the Old. This is beautifully illustrated by Origen. Writing on the words from Matthew, "Blessed are the peacemakers," he says that a man becomes a peacemaker as he

> demonstrates that that which appears to others to be a conflict in the Scriptures is no conflict, and exhibits their concord and peace, whether of the Old Scriptures with the New, or of the Law with the Prophets, or of the Gospels with the Apostolic Scriptures, or of the Apostolic Scriptures with each other. . . . . For he knows that all the Scripture is the one perfect and harmonized instrument of God, which from different sounds gives forth one saving voice to those willing to learn . . . .[1]

For our first example from our writers we may observe Justin's quotation of Luke 3: 22 (cf. Matt. 3: 17; Mark 1: 11; Ps. 2: 7): "Thou art my beloved Son; in Thee I am well pleased" (Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπατός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα). In place of this reading Justin has Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκα σε.

To begin with, it must be remembered that Justin represents himself as debating with a Jew. That fact immediately suggests the aptness of appeal to the Old Testament. The contents of the Dialogue show that if he can prove that Old Testament Scripture has been fulfilled in Jesus, he will have won his point. Consequently he places before Trypho the various ways in which Jesus has met the requirements of Scripture. Jesus did not need to be empowered by any divine visitation. Drawing a parallel from the story of the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem (which, by

---

[1] Commentary on Matthew ii.

the way, may I think be almost entirely reconstructed from the Old Testament), he shows that the baptism of Jesus was merely a proof to men of his nature:

> For it was not his entrance into Jerusalem sitting on an ass, which we have showed was prophesied, that empowered him to be Christ, but it furnished men with a proof that He is the Christ; just as it was necessary in the time of John that men have proof, that they might know who is Christ. For when John sat by the Jordan and preached the baptism of repentance . . . . he cried to them "I am not the Christ. . . . ." And when Jesus came to the Jordan, He was considered to be the son of Joseph the carpenter; and he appeared without comeliness as the Scriptures declared; and He was deemed a carpenter. . . . . But then the Holy Ghost, and for man's sake, as I formerly stated, lighted on Him, in the form of a dove and there came at the same instant from the heavens a voice, personating Christ, what the Father would say to Him: "Thou art my Son: this day Have I begotten Thee"; saying that His generation would take place for men, at the time when they would become acquainted with Him: . . . .[1]

The phrase, "In thee I am well pleased," carried no special distinction. But here we have a real sign that Jesus is the long-hoped-for Messiah. Not that Jesus became Son in a special sense at the baptism. The value of the experience lies elsewhere: in its proof of the Messiahship of Jesus. This is harmonization to the Old Testament.

Of the many writers consulted on this quotation only one has seen the possibility envisaged here. Kaye has the following:

> In this passage Justin appears to have referred to Luke 3: 22; 4: 8, but, quoting from memory to have cited the words of Psalm 2: 7 instead of Luke 3: 22. Is there not also reason for suspecting that Justin, in arguing with a Jew, might think that he added weight to his argument by substituting for the actual words of the Gospel, words from the Old Testament, which the Jews interpreted of the Messiah.[2]

It will be noted that this wording of Justin is also found in Luke 3: 22 according to D and in certain Latin manuscripts: a, b, c, ff_2. It is also found in the Gospel of the Ebionites. Westcott contends that the material common to both Justin and this Gospel must have been borrowed from a third source. Clement of Alexandria and others refer these words of the Psalm to the baptism of Jesus.

---

[1]Justin Dialogue 88.

[2]John Kaye, Apology of Justin Martyr (Edinburgh: J. Grant, 1912), pp. 105, 106.

One other example of harmonization to the Old Testament may be cited. This also comes from Justin's Dialogue with Trypho (103: 8). He there quotes Luke 22: 44 (cf. Matt. 26: 39): καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἱδρὼς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. But Justin omits αἵματος.

Of this fact Westcott has made the following comment:

> The omission of the word αἵματος was probably suggested by the passage in Psalm 22: 14 which Justin is explaining. It cannot have arisen from any Docetic tendency as the whole context shows. The entire pericope (vv. 43, 44) is omitted by very important authorities but I cannot find that αἵματος alone is omitted elsewhere than in Justin.[1]

I think there can be no doubt that the introduction of αἵματος into the discussion would ruin his argument from the Old Testament Psalm. The passage from the Psalm pertinent to the discussion runs as follows:

> I am poured out like water,
> And all my bones are out of joint:
> My heart is like wax;
> It is melted within me.

Since the simile of the Psalm includes the phrase "like water," the inclusion of ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος "as drops of blood," would contradict it and would nullify his argument.

The argument advanced here seems quite conclusive in the light of the context.

> The statement, "All my bones are poured out and dispersed like water; my heart has become like wax, melting in the midst of my belly," was a prediction of that which happened to him on that night when men came out against Him to the Mount of Olives to seize Him. For in the memoirs which I say were drawn up by His apostles, and those who followed them [it is recorded], that His sweat fell down like drops while He was praying, and saying, "If it be possible, let this cup pass."

Ethical and Practical Variation

The heading probably needs clarification. It grows from the circumstance that the Christian leaders of the second century were faced with the perennial problems of moral living, and the necessity of providing appropriate and strong sanctions for right living. Although dogma occupied a large place in their lives and in their writings, it must be said that even the more philosoph-

---

[1]B. F. Westcott, The Canon of the New Testament (Cambridge: The Macmillan Company, 1889), p. 115, n. 1.

ically inclined writers like Clement of Alexandria felt it to be a duty of no mean proportions to stress practical conduct. Even the smallest and to us most trivial concern of everyday life was not overlooked. And as long as Christianity remained an illegal religion in the Roman Empire the sanctions within the group required special power. One such sanction was the sacred Scriptures, as they always are as far as the masses of the people are concerned. "Thus saith the Lord" settles the matter for many an individual.

We shall note two examples of this motivation in the writers under consideration, one from the writings of Justin and one from those of Clement. In the First Apology (16: 10), Justin quotes Luke 10: 16: Ὁ ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ. ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἀποστειλαντά με. But Justin's form of the quotation differs from this. He has Ὃς γὰρ ἀκούει μου καὶ ποιεῖ ἃ λέγω, ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντος με. By the simplification of the sentence and by the addition of "and doeth what I say," the writer has produced a strong sanction for action on the part of Christians.

That Justin should emphasize this phrase is not to be thought strange. The emphasis of his whole argument lies right in this: those who are Christians in fact do the sayings of Jesus as set forth in chapters 15 and 16. The remaining part of chapter 16 bears this out:

> "By their works ye shall know them. And every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire." And as to those who are not living pursuant to these His teachings, and are Christians only in name, we demand that all such be punished by you.

It is evident that his aim here is practical.

The other example is from Clement's Paedagogue (iii. 3). We have chosen it because it illustrates the limits of ordinary life to which Scripture was relevant. The New Testament passage is Matthew 5: 36: Μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου ὀμόσῃς, ὅτι οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ποιῆσαι ἢ μέλαιναν: "Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, for thou canst not make one hair white or black." Clement has οὐδεὶς δὲ ἄλλος, φησὶν ὁ κύριος, δύναται ποιῆσαι τρίχα λευκὴν ἢ μελαιναν: "And no other, says the Lord, is able t make the hair white or black."

In the Gospel the injunction is against swearing. The reference to the hair is purely figurative. But here, Clément

makes it refer literally to changing the color of the hair, by dyeing it. Men have no right artificially to color their hair. The passage runs:

> Prophecy has called him (God), the "Ancient of days; and the hair of his head was as white as pure wool," says the prophet. "And none other," says the Lord, "can make the hair white or black." How, then, do these godless ones work in rivalry with God, or rather violently oppose Him, when they transmute the hair made white by Him?

In view of this application, it would not be appropriate to speak of making "one" hair white or black. The reference must be to the hair of the head as such. Hence the omission of μίαν and the resulting general reference to the hair.

Stylistic Variation

In the Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen we have a classical example of what actually did take place. Reference has been made to this incident but the story has not been detailed. The bishops of Cyprus had met to consult on a particular emergency. Sozomen and a bishop by the name of Triphyllius met with them. The latter seems to have been a particularly eloquent man. The account runs:

> When an assembly had convened, having been requested to address the people Triphyllius had occasion, in the middle of his discourse to quote the text, "Take up thy bed and walk," but he substituted the word σκίμπους, for the word κράββατος. Sosomen was indignant and exclaimed, "Art thou greater than he who uttered the word κράββατος that thou art ashamed to use his words?" When he had said this, he turned from the throne of the priests and looked towards the people; by this act he taught them to keep the man who is proud of eloquence within his bounds.[1]

Holtzmann, speaking of intentional variations in the text of the New Testament, remarks that "a thinking copyist may in some circumstances be more dangerous than a thoughtless one." And Cone elaborates this as follows:

> There are "learned corrections" of a linguistic or grammatical nature and syntactical changes in the interest of what the copyist appears to have regarded as an improvement of the construction.[2]

Gregory finds three stages in the early development of the text, (1) the original text, (2) the re-wrought text which

---

[1]Sozomen Ecclesiastical History 11.

[2]Orello Cone, Gospel Criticism (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1891), p. 13.

came into existence in the second century and is identified with the Western text of Westcott and Hort, and (3) the polished text. Of number three Gregory says that

> the moment Christian science existed, that moment it busied itself with the text of the New Testament. . . . . Whether at Alexandria, or at Antioch, or at Caesarea, when men who had an accurate training in grammar came to examine closely the text, they found many a trifle that did not agree with the rules then long recognized for the use of the Greek language. They were acquainted with the dangers of manuscript transmission, and had at least some vague conception of the apparently unlearned character of early Christian communities. When, then, they found in the text of the books of the New Testament what seemed to them to be or actually were faults of one kind or another, two ways of accounting for these were open to them. It was possible to say that the writers of these books had been guided and protected from faults by the Holy Spirit, that the original form of their writings must have been in every respect all that could be desired, and if in the copies in hand there were found errors or faults, these must necessarily be attributed to the carelessness or ignorance of the Christians who had from time to time copied the rolls. There is, then, no need to say that Christian scholars, detecting these faults, corrected them without hesitation; and considered themselves not merely justified in so doing, but as forced by duty to do so. That was one view.
>
> It was possible also to say that these writers of the New Testament were most of them by no means so well at home in the Greek language as to be able to use it skilfully, to write it correctly. They were guided by the Spirit of God in the sense of their utterances. But this Spirit of God did not occupy itself with the external form of the language. In consequence, the sacred writers had written less elegantly and less correctly than was really to be desired in a book of so great moment. That had not been a serious detriment to the spread of Christianity during those early years of plain preaching. Now, however, that cultured men began to interest themselves for Christianity, now that the reading of these writings formed so important a part in the services of the churches, it was necessary that a skilful hand smooth away the linguistic roughnesses and make the text, if not good, at least better than it had been. We may be sure that the scholars of Alexandria and Antioch and Caesarea viewed the matter from one or the other of these two points of view.[1]

Coming now to the writings of Justin and Clement we find many evidences of this stylistic motivation. Both of them substitute νοῦς for καρδία in Matthew 6: 21: "For where your treasure is there will your heart be also." Undoubtedly the term νοῦς would be much more at home in the Greek environment. We have men-

---

[1]C. R. Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1907), pp. 492 ff.

tioned Sozomen's repudiation of the word κράββατος for σκίμπους in Mark 2: 11, but Clement does the same thing (Paed. i. 2) undoubtedly preferring the more elegant expression. In quoting Matthew 5: 6: "Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be filled," Clement substitutes πλησθήσονται for χορτασθήσονται, a word which originally applied to the feeding and fattening of animals in a stall. But Luke is able to use πλησθήσονται in the poetic words of the Magnificat.[1] In quoting Mark 10: 25: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God," Clement substitutes βελόνης for ῥαφίδος. It was said by the grammarian Phrynichus, "as for ῥαφίς, nobody would know what it is." It is of interest to note that the more literary Luke uses βελόνης although Matthew has ῥαφίς. But Clement states expressly that he is quoting Mark. This would seem to indicate that he chooses the more classical expression by preference.

Explanatory Variation

Goguel calls this category "particularly important." The variants, he points out,

> result from the fact that those who copied the New Testament and those for whom it was copied agreed in the conviction that the books which composed it were the perfect expression of the Truth. As a result, the New Testament could not contain error in the true sense of the word, nor any real obscurity. Wherever these appeared their elimination was a duty.[2]

In quoting Matthew 5: 28: "Everyone that looketh on a woman to lust (desire) after her hath committed adultery already with her in his heart," Justin (Ap. i. 15. 1) adds παρὰ τῷ θεῷ. This is clearly explanatory. How does one by desire alone commit adultery? The answer is that in God's sight there is no distinction between the desire alone and desire resulting in the overt act of adultery.

Again, an example from Clement's Paedagogue (ii. 1. 7) gives the substitution in Matthew 4: 4: "Man shall not live by bread alone but by every word proceeding out of the mouth of God," of "the righteous man," for ὁ ἄνθρωπος, "man." He makes the same

---

[1]Luke 9: 17.

[2]Maurice Goguel, Le texte et les éditions du Nouveau Testament grec (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1920), p. 62.

substitution at least on one other occasion (Paed. iii. 7. 40). The explanation may lie in Clement's religious philosophy. The true Christian moves on a level superior to that of the masses of humanity. Others, it is true, may live on a purely physical level. They live, he says, "that they may eat, as irrational creatures." But the bread of the Christian is the "true bread, the bread of the heavens." There is a real kinship here with the idea expressed by Plato: "Many are the wand-bearers, but the Bacchanals are few." Indeed Clement quotes these very words approvingly.

We shall look at one other example from this division. In the Stromata[1] Clement quotes Matthew 5: 3 (cf. Luke 6: 20), Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. But for this Clement substitutes: Μακάριοι δὲ καὶ οἱ πτωχοὶ εἴτε πνεύματι εἴτε περιουσίᾳ διὰ δικαιοσύνην δηλονότι.

The use that Clement makes of this passage is most interesting and instructive. It illustrates the sort of thing that the early Christians felt impelled to do with it. Since not all of the early Christians were poor, it created a problem for those who had a measure of worldly goods. The context of the quotation is interesting:

> "And blessed are the poor," whether "in spirit" or in circumstances--that is, if for righteousness' sake. It is not the poor, simply, but those who have become poor for righteousness' sake, that he pronounces blessed--those who have despised the honours of this world in order to attain the good.

He recognizes that Matthew has added the phrase "in spirit" to "blessed are the poor," for purposes of explanation: Διὸ καὶ προσέθηκεν ὁ Ματθαῖος· Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ· πῶς; τῷ πνεύματι. It would seem from this that he deliberately chose the reading of Matthew in preference to that of Luke. This choice throws light on how a variant like that of Matthew came into being. The social situation demanded an interpretation of the Lukan passage. Clement here provides a demonstration of the kind of process that went on. He had wealthy people to deal with; people who took seriously the words of Jesus respecting riches. His conclusion is that salvation

> does not lie in our external circumstances, neither in our wealth nor in our poverty, neither in the world's praise nor

---

[1]Clement Stromata iv. 6.

in the world's neglect . . . . . The qualities that determine life or death lie in the soul, nor should the reason of our final destiny be sought in any other quarter than the soul's inward state and disposition. There is a genuine and spurious wealth, as there is a genuine and spurious poverty. Both depend on interior qualities.

Dogmatic Variation

This is by far the most significant of all the various categories, accounting for the great majority of non-accidental variations in the New Testament text. This is not at all strange when we consider the part played by dogma in the early Christian community. Harnack has made clear how closely it was related to the history of the text in the early centuries:

> When the New Testament was created the church already had a doctrine; indeed this doctrine itself helped to create the New Testament. Doctrinal teaching could not be, nor ought to have been, rendered superfluous and thrust aside by the new written work; and it continued to be carried on in the church. But all doctrine, however supernatural it may have been in its foundations depends for its exposition upon reason, and with the help of reason necessarily aims at simple and clear expression. As soon, however, as a sacred document comes into existence, doctrine begins to depend less and less on reason for its development; for each rational element can now be replaced by an authoritative element. The consequence is that both rational and authoritative elements are intermingled in the development of doctrine, that everyone becomes accustomed to such intermingling, and that the sense and desire for clear and logical thinking gradually becomes dulled. All this is exemplified to full extent in the history of the development of Dogma in the church. We may observe it already in Irenaeus, in Tertullian with special clearness and in Origen. They operate with ratio and with autoritas, i.e. with proofs from Scripture, and interchange the two elements at will. A text from the New Testament is for them as good a proof as a logical argument. If the dogmatist was at a loss for an argument, a passage of Scripture came to his help; if doubts arose in his mind, they were repressed by a word of Scripture; if a proof could not be found, it was supplied by a verse of Scripture; if discrepancies were met with, these need only be so in appearance, for Scripture contains no discrepancies and yet Scripture is absolutely consistent.[1]

Harnack proceeds to show that this condition greatly affected dogmatics. But the reverse must also have been true. If dogma and the text were so closely related, it is unthinkable that the latter would not become to some extent contaminated.

---

[1]Adolf von Harnack, The Origin of the New Testament, trans. J. R. Wilkinson (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925), pp. 158-60.

This influence which dogma exerted on the early text has received some attention from textual critics. We shall note several instances of this recognition.

Consider first the statement of Rendel Harris. He says that

> we have learnt from our study of the growth of the Western text of the Acts to distrust entirely the assumption that there are no such things as heretical and factional depravations of the text. As far as we are able to judge, one half of the Roman world Montanized its Acts of the Apostles, and the readings thus produced are found from the banks of the Tyne to beyond the Cataracts of the Nile. Hence we find it hard to believe that Dr. Hort can be right when he says that it is his distinct belief "that even among the unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes." The statement seems too strong; and while we are willing to admit that the transcription of the New Testament in its successive stages has been accomplished, in the main, with excellent intentions, there are certain places where a foreign and factional hand can be detected.[1]

This tendency to alter Scripture for dogmatic purposes, however, was not confined to heretical or factional groups. Or perhaps we might ask what constituted orthodoxy in this early period. And even if we confine ourselves to a consideration of the methods of those writers who later were accepted by the dominant and successful group within the Christian movement we discover that they were doing the same thing as their opponents. It would be surprising were this not the case.

Scrivener, on the basis of Irenaeus' statement which prefers the reading 666 to 616 in the Apocalypse, concludes that we discern here the living interest which the contents of the Apocalypse had for the Christians of the second century, "even up to the preservation of its minutest reading."[2] This critic, however, fails to recognize that Irenaeus had worked out an elaborate numerical scheme based on the number 666, his preferred reading. His prime motivation may be found in this circumstance rather than in a critical desire to adhere to the reading of what he calls the "most approved and ancient manuscripts."[3]

Furthermore, Scrivener is compelled immediately to recog-

---

[1] J. Rendel Harris, A Study of Codex Bezae (Cambridge: The University Press, 1891), p. 228.

[2] Scrivener, op. cit., pp. 261, 262.

[3] Irenaeus Against Heresies v. 30.

nize that the early Fathers were not always as critical as Irenaeus might lead us to conclude. He notices that Clement of Alexandria complains of those who tamper with or metaphrase the Gospels for their own ends. And he is also compelled to agree with the observation of Tregelles that while Clement condemns others for doing this, he himself ventures on liberties no less extravagant when he quotes Matthew 19: 24: Εὐκοπώτερον ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τῆς τρυμαλιᾶς τῆς ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλύσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

Kirsopp Lake, in an inaugural lecture delivered before the University of Leiden, took as his subject, "The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament."[1] He made a strong case in this treatise for conjectural emendation in the field of New Testament criticism. He arrived at this position in the following manner.

Westcott and Hort destroyed faith in the value of the Textus Receptus. They, themselves, failed to give us the true text, but did "show us how to reduce to order the unwieldy mass of Greek MSS., and sketched the true use and value of the evidence of Versions and Fathers."

This enabled their successors properly to evaluate discoveries like that of Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson in the MS of the Old Syriac version; also Professor Blass's use of Patristic quotations.

> These discoveries and additions have paved the way for a general acceptance of the belief that we must abandon the method of basing the text primarily on the Greek MSS., and of regarding the Versions and Patristic quotations as possessing only secondary value.
> It has become more and more probable that Greek MSS. as a whole[2] only represent one type of text and its corruptions, that the Latin Versions and Fathers represent another type, and the Syriac versions a third, while perhaps Clement of Alexandria may provide a fourth.
> It is between these texts, and not between individual MSS., that we shall have in the last resort to judge, so that the situation which we must face is that we have to deal with a number of local texts, that no two localities used quite the same text, that no locality has yet been shown to have used a text demonstrably better than its ri-

---

[1]Kirsopp Lake, The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament (Oxford: Parker and Son, 1904).

[2]There are of course a few exceptions, such as D, the Ferrar group, and some others.

> vals, and that no one of these local texts is represented in an uncorrupt form by any single MS.

The result is, says Lake, that the textual critic may no longer think that he can edit the original text. He must first edit the local texts. In each of these localities he has

> the evidence of the versions used in the local church and of the writers who used them, but it is not very large and in no case is without traces of corruption. Therefore the student of these local texts is reduced to the level of the critics of classical texts. In the face of suspected corruption he has the right to use conjectural emendation.

The next step will be the attempt to reconstruct the text which lies behind all the local texts.

> It is too early to attempt to say much about the character which this text will assume: but personally I believe that we shall find that some corruptions have attached themselves to all local texts, or to almost all, and that it will therefore be impossible to reconstruct the underlying text by any mechanical method. Especially is this likely to be the case with doctrinal corruptions.

Lake exemplifies this by a "remarkable discovery" of Conybeare: Eusebius quotes Matthew 28: 19 at least eighteen times in the form, "Go ye into all the world and make disciples of all nations in my name." Riggenbach increased the number of times to twenty-five. The remarkable thing about this is that Eusebius, living in Caesarea where there was a great Christian library, knew Matthew 28: 19 in a form which omitted "Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

According to Lake, the importance of this for the textual critic is two-fold: (1) It probably enables him to edit the text without these words, and to regard them as an interpolation. Eusebius could not have omitted the words on purpose. "Baptismal custom would secure the insertion of the words: nothing known to history would account for their omission." And it is significant that there are two other passages containing baptismal texts which have been shown to be due to interpolation. These are Mark 16: 16, which now is admitted to be a part of the spurious conclusion of the second gospel, and the account of the baptism of the Ethiopian Eunuch which inserts a demand for a confession of faith as a preliminary to baptism.

(2) It shows that doctrinal modifications of the text are so early, for the most part, that it is vain to expect much manuscript evidence. The task must be approached on another basis.

A small amount of evidence is sufficient to establish the claim to consideration of readings which are likely to have been obnoxious to early doctrine, and probably we may say that, at least in attempting to reconstruct the text which lies behind the local texts, we ought sometimes to regard with suspicion readings, against which we can produce no external testimony, but only contextual unsuitability, and to be prepared to give a tolerant hearing to the claims of conjectural emendation in such cases.

Instead, therefore, of working with a single Greek text which has a few various readings at the bottom of the page, the scholar of the future, as soon as the textualists have supplied him with the material, must use, in the first place, a series of local texts, differing in many important readings, and in the second, a reconstructed original text, which cannot be proved to have been used by any definite Church, but which must lie behind and explain all the local texts.[1]

This will alter the task of the textual critic quite considerably. He will want to know not only what the original meaning of a passage was, but also "what the church thought it meant and how it altered its wording in order to emphasize its meaning." An example is found in Matthew 28: 19. Aphraates does not have the baptismal gloss, therefore the assumption may be made that the church to which he belonged did not have it, and did not interpret the passage to mean the baptism of all converts. On the other hand, the early Western church did have it, and the implication is that it interpreted the command to make disciples as including the baptism of all converts. The modern exegete has to choose between the two readings.

Furthermore, single passages must be treated in connection with similar passages. If the text of the other passage is modified by textual criticism, the exegesis and probably the textual criticism of the first passage may also be altered.

Lake gives as an example of this principle the attitude we must take toward John 3: 5 as a result of our changed attitude toward Matthew 28: 20. He argues that since the context does not call for the inclusion of the phrase "by water and," since the tendency in the church was to connect regeneration with baptism, since Ecclesiastical writings like the Apostolic Constitutions and the Clementine Homilies show traces of manipulating the pas-

---

[1]I take it to mean that in this argument Lake proceeds upon an assumption similar to that made in this thesis, namely, that if the motivating forces present in the early church can be identified we shall be provided with valuable means for reconstructing the original.

sage on behalf of doctrine, and since Justin Martyr's text does not seem to have contained the reference to water, the chances are that it is no longer safe "to neglect the possibility that the reference to baptism, based on the mention of water in verse 5 may be due to an already recognized tendency in the early church to insert such allusions." Lake's conclusion is that the exegete of John 3: 5 will be bound to give attention to the kind of evidence which he has adduced as pointing to the original existence of a different text.

The first example from our writers is Clement's quotation of Matthew 21: 9: "And the multitudes that went before him, and they that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest." But Clement's text reads: "Plucking branches of olives or palms, <u>the children</u> went forth to meet the Lord, and cried, saying Hosanna to the son of David. Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord."[1]

The familiar New Testament text does not mention that "the children" went out to meet the Lord. It says, simply, that "the crowd" went out. It is clear, in the light of the context why this allusion to the children should be made by the writer. The entire chapter makes the point that the Christians are the "children" of Scripture:

> It remains for us to consider the children whom Scripture points to; then to give the paedagogue charge of them. We are the children. In many ways Scripture celebrates us. . . . . Accordingly, in the gospel "the Lord standing on the shore, says to the disciples . . . . and called aloud, Children have ye any meat?"--addressing those who were already in the position of disciples as children. . . . .
> The prophetic spirit also distinguishes us as children. "Plucking," it is said, "branches of olives or palms, the children went forth to meet the Lord, and cried, saying Hosanna to the son of David! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

This chapter of the <u>Paedagogue</u> is an excellent example of the way in which non-accidental variation of this type took place, for the instance just cited is but one of several found in the same general context. We may note one other.

Clement quotes Matthew 11: 16 (cf. Luke 7: 32): "Whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting

---

[1]Clement <u>Paedagogue</u> i. 5.

in the market-places, who call unto their fellows and say, We piped unto you and ye did not dance; we wailed and ye did not mourn." But Clement makes a change in the first part of the quotation. In the Gospels the "generation" is compared to children sitting in the market-place. But in Clement's writing the children are likened to the kingdom of heaven: Αὖθις τε παιδίοις ὁμοιοῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐν ἀγοραῖς καθημένοις καὶ λέγουσιν, ηὐλήσαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε, ἐθρηνήσαμεν καὶ οὐκ ἐκόψασθε.

Burkitt has said that the first line is "merely introductory." But the fact is that this introductory part is for Clement the most important. The quotation proper beginning with ηὐλήσαμεν and ending with ἐκόψασθε has no particular function in the context. But the "introductory" comparison does have:

> He calls them (his disciples) children; for He says, "Children, a little while I am with you." And, again, He likens the kingdom of heaven to children sitting in the market-places, and saying, etc. And it is not alone the gospel that holds these sentiments. Prophecy also agrees with it. David accordingly says, "Praise, O children, the Lord. . . . ." It says also by Esaias, "Here am I, and the children that God hath given me."

Again, as in the preceding example, the desire is to show that the proposition, "We are the children of Scripture," is correct.

Another illustration of dogmatic motivation is found in the Stromata of Clement (ii. 5). He quotes Mark 10: 25 (cf. Matt. 19: 24; Luke 18: 25): "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God." But Clement quotes it thus: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to be a philosopher": Πειστέρον οὖν μᾶλλον τῇ γραφῇ λεγούσῃ, θᾶττον κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος βελόνης διελεύσεσθαι, ἢ πλούσιον φιλοσοφεῖν.

Tollinton points out why the change was made:

> Not only will he alter tense, number, person, and the like, to suit his context, he will also add words, or omit, or change, when it fits his purpose to do so. This may be made clear from one or two examples: "It is easier" he says, "for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to be a philosopher." Christianity being in Clement's eyes the true philosophy, the last phrase is not an unnatural equivalent to write in place of the words, "enter into the kingdom of God," which stands in the Synoptic Gospels. But it is clearly an intentional variation, not a different reading.

So also in quoting I Cor. 13: 8 (Q.D.S. 38) Clement sub-

stitutes for "whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away," the words, "cures are left behind on earth." Tollinton remarks that

> not even Saint Paul's authority will induce Clement to say that knowledge, Gnosis, shall vanish away. He would rather give offence to the whole medical College of Alexandria, of whom many were perhaps his personal friends. So the text of Saint Paul is adapted accordingly.[1]

A final illustration of variation for dogmatic purposes may be found in the Paedagogue of Clement. He quotes John 1: 1: "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God," but with a variation. In place of πρὸς τὸν θεόν he has ἐν τῷ θεῷ. A study of the passages in which Clement quotes this verse from John shows that he tended to make this substitution. The reason for it is probably dogmatic. For Clement sometimes the distinction between the Logos and God becomes extremely vague. Again, Tollinton has pointed out that

> in a number of passages the unity and equality of the Son with the Father is implied or directly taught under terms of local or mutual relationship. The Son is in the Father and the Father is in the Son. Such duality is compatible with the completest unity, for "both are a unity even God." Clement is fond of varying Saint John's term of relationship [πρός] for one of more local connotation [ἐν].[2]

The instance under consideration is a good example of this fondness:

> Nothing, then, is hated by God, nor yet by the Word. For both are one--that is God. For He has said "In the beginning the Word was in God [ἐν τῷ θεῷ] and the Word was God.

The emphasis that this discussion has placed on the motivating forces that were present to modify the text in the second century is but a phase of the new insight which is developing as to the place of internal evidence in the method of restoring the primitive text. This need was stressed by Dean Colwell in a discussion before the New Testament Club of the University of Chicago. This method must take into proper account the forces operating to produce change which were current in the environment, especially the dogmatic.

It might be well, in conclusion, to summarize some of the values which emerge from this study. The summary follows:

---

[1]R. B. Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria (London: Williams and Norgate, 1914), II, 178.

[2]Ibid., I, 343, 344.

1. A recognition of the importance of the social and religious situation and its close relationship to the New Testament text. Hence, textual criticism is related to the "organic life of the Christian community."

2. A recognition of the fluid state of the New Testament text during the first and second centuries.

3. The recognition of the bearing of certain theories held by the ancients on the transmission of the text. These theories were (1) that Scripture must never contradict itself, and (2) that it was the duty of scribes to make "corrections" in the text. To "correct" a text often meant that it must be brought into harmony with ideas received in the church.

4. On the basis of the foregoing, no violation of propriety was present.

5. The recognition of the necessity of taking motivation into proper account in any attempt to reconstruct the original autographs.

6. A recognition of the place and importance of an analysis of motivation resulting in the identification of specific kinds of motivation.

7. Each of the resulting categories may be utilized as a tool in the hands of the textual critic.

8. A recognition of the fact that the early Fathers are important not only as witnesses for the text prior to them but because they affected the text after them, and at the same time illustrate the process of non-accidental variation.

9. A recognition of the scope of the forces making for non-accidental variation.

10. A recognition of the fact that canonicity did not guarantee the purity of the sacred text.

11. The cumulative effect is to stress the importance of motivation in the production of variation in the New Testament text.